

#### REMARKS

The description and the abstract have been amended in view of the objections raised in points 1 and 2 on page 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 10-18 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 19-36. It is believed that the new claims 19-36 are not open to rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The examiner has objected that claim 10 is indefinite because the guide element 7 allegedly does not accomplish deadlocking of the latch bolt 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As shown in FIG. 7, when the guide element moves downward from the position shown in FIG. 3 (after first moving upward to the position shown in FIG. 5 to release the stop member 11), the guide surface 7a of the guide element provides deadlocking of the latch bolt 3 (i.e. prevents the latch bolt from being pressed into the lock case). The fact that the guide element 7 also provides deadlocking of the dead bolt 13 does not negate the fact that the guide element provides deadlocking of the latch bolt 3.

Claims 10, 12, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over Kärkkäinen et al. Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the examiner has indicated that claims 11, 13, 14 and 17 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant nevertheless believes that claims that are broader in scope are allowable over Kärkkäinen et al.

Both the previous claim 10 and the current claim 19 refer to a stop member, and the examiner has indicated that he considers the stop 21 shown in Kärkkäinen et al to be an apt counterpart for the stop member of the present application. As shown in FIGS. 1 and 2 of Kärkkäinen et al, the stop 21 is at the inner end of the auxiliary bolt and moves with the auxiliary bolt. Claim 19, on the other hand, specifies that the stop member is supported by the auxiliary bolt and is movable relative to the auxiliary bolt. Applicant therefore believes that claim 19 is

not anticipated by Kärkkäinen et al. Further, applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the lock disclosed by Kärkkäinen et al to provide for the stop to be movable relative to the auxiliary bolt because the function of the stop is to limit movement of the auxiliary bolt 19 to the left of FIG. 1 by engaging the force transmission piece 11 as shown in FIG. 2.

Claim 29 contains substantially identical wording to claim 19 with respect to the stop member. Therefore, claim 29 is not anticipated by Kärkkäinen et al.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that claims 19 and 29 are patentable. It follows that the dependent claims also are patentable.

Respectfully submitted,



---

John Smith-Hill  
Reg. No. 27,730

SMITH-HILL & BEDELL, P.C.  
16100 N.W. Cornell Road, Suite 220  
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

Tel. (503) 574-3100  
Fax (503) 574-3197  
Docket: AWEK 3308